DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 063 CE 049 292

TITLE	Tutor Support Systems 1986-87.
INSTITUTION	Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Div. of Adult Basic Education.
PUB DATE	28 Aug 87
CONTRACT	99-7006
NOTE	33p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; Adult Programs; Comparative Analysis; Consultation Programs; Inservice Education; *Literacy Education; Mentors; Peer Counseling; Resource Materials; *Social Support Groups; Teaching Methods; *Tutorial Programs; *Tutors; *Volunteer Training; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	310 Project

ABSTRACT

The Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council tested four systems that could be used to provide supportive services to a minimum of 100 volunteer literacy tutors. The following four support systems were developed: a program providing for telephone consultation by a reading specialist, informal meetings of volunteer tutors, workshop class reunions, and a tutor mentoring program. The informal local gatherings of tutors proved to be the best method of providing tutors with an opportunity for continued contact and support. The method was found to allow a great deal of flexibility in that the tutors were able to choose the times, locations, and frequency of their meetings. Because the tutors could share the responsibilities in making arrangements for the meetings, the staff coordinator did not need to attend each meeting. The workshop reunions were the second most effective of the support systems tested. They were advantageous because they offered an opportunity to bring together volunteers who first met at their preservice training and thus helped the tutors develop a special sense of community. The telephone consultations with volunteer reading specialists did not work out as well as had been hoped and thus were rated third among the four methods tested. It was concluded, however, that, given certain guidelines, the method can be an effective way of providing supportive services to volunteer tutors. The mentoring strategy was poorly received by those participating in the test, perhaps because the tutors in the program preferred more solitary activities. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AE3025-509
C.1

Tutor Support Systems

1986-87

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council
5920 Kirkwood Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15206
Executive Director: Donald G. Block
Project Director: Joan Gauthier

ED289063

This project was conducted with support from federal funds under Section 310 of the Adult Education Act granted by the Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Adult Basic Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126-0333

Contract No: 99-7006

Amount: $5,000

Fiscal Year: 1986-1987

August 28, 1987

RECEIVED
SEP 2 1987
DIVISION OF ADULT EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Christopher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This report is a result of a project supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Copies of this report have been submitted to AdvancE and ERIC.

CE049292

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
Abstract		ii
Introduction		1
Chapter 1.	Telephone counseling by a reading specialist	4
Chapter 2.	Geographic clusters	7
Chapter 3.	Reunions of workshop classes	12
Chapter 4.	Mentors	14
Chapter 5.	Conclusions and recommendations	16
Appendix:	Attachments	20

ABSTRACT

The Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council tested four systems of tutor support, to serve a minimum of one hundred (100) volunteer tutors. The support systems developed were: telephone consultation by a reading specialist, informal meetings of volunteer tutors, workshop class reunions and tutor mentoring. The following report should be of interest to any program using volunteer tutors in one-on-one situations where there is no direct supervision of the volunteers by a classroom teacher. The findings are applicable to rural and urban programs alike. Strategies for developing continuing volunteer leadership under staff supervision are suggested.

INTRODUCTION

The Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council was utilizing some 300 volunteer tutors in its adult literacy program at the beginning of this project. We anticipated an increase of 200 trained volunteers over the program year with only limited growth in staff over the same period. A primary concern of the program's administrators was the effectiveness and motivation of these tutors. This concern led us to apply for and conduct a project (#99-6005) to develop a series of tutor inservice instruction (Continuing Education for Volunteer Tutors in Allegheny County) wherein four formal topics were presented in various locations throughout the county. This project was well received and reached close to one hundred (100) volunteer tutors. It was noted, in the evaluations submitted by the attendees, that many found the informal sharing which resulted as a by-product of the formal sessions to be of great value. In direct response to this stated benefit, the staff proposed to develop and test four informal methods of tutor support.

Goal I: To increase contact with and support of volunteer tutors in Allegheny County.

Objective Ia: To develop and test four tutor support systems other than in-service training.

Objective Ib: To provide support to a minimum of one hundred (100) volunteer tutors during the project year.

It was evident to our staff that volunteers spread over the county, many of whom work full-time, find the scheduling of yet another meeting and the necessary travel involved to attend those meetings, difficult. GPLC very much appreciates the commitment of time, energy and money that these volunteers willingly give. It is our aim to offer as much assistance and support as we can with as little inconvenience to these volunteers as is possible. Therefore, a more neighborhood-based approach seemed appropriate.

We proposed four tutor support systems: telephone counseling by a reading specialist, informal meetings of volunteers, workshop class reunions and tutor mentoring. By taking assistance to the tutors, either by telephone or at meetings held in the various neighborhoods in which they lived and undertook their tutoring assignments, we believed we could reach many more volunteers.

Goal II: To increase the effectiveness of volunteers in adult basic education.

Objective IIa: To increase tutors' confidence and expertise in dealing with the needs of literacy students.

Volunteer tutors are as highly individualistic as are their adult students. It was clear to staff that various forms of support were necessary to appeal to tutoring styles and specific needs as they occurred. We wanted to offer a "menu" from which volunteers could select what seemed most appropriate and convenient to their individual situations. By providing a variety of support mechanisms we expected to ensure more effective, confident tutors. We also needed to provide an efficient means by which staff could be available to monitor tutoring activity in

other than the time-intensive one-on-one consultation.

Goal III: To improve the quality of literacy programming in Allegheny County and throughout Pennsylvania.

Objective IIIa: To provide conclusions and recommendations concerning the most effective tutor support systems.

Objective IIIb: To develop volunteer and staff leaders for the continuation of this project beyond 1986-87.

It is hoped that the conclusions reached in Chapter 5 will be of use to other volunteer literacy programs, both urban and rural. The applications may vary and not all systems will be appropriate for each program, but this project has assisted GPLC to provide support which recent studies indicate has a direct effect on tutor retention.

Literacy programs typically have a low ratio of staff (volunteer or paid) to volunteer tutors. It is important to develop volunteer leadership to assist the program staff. We feel that some of the steps outlined in the following chapters may assist other programs in increasing volunteer participation and in retaining trained volunteers, sometimes in less demanding roles.

We have chosen to present each type of support system in a separate chapter. We will indicate there the approximate time frame for each as well as the staff and other personnel involved in each system.

CHAPTER 1

Telephone counseling by a reading specialist

At the time of preparation for this project, GPLC did not have a staff reading specialist. We had been in contact with the Three Rivers Reading Council, the local affiliate of the International Reading Association, and were advised that several of its members had expressed an interest in assisting our program. At this time our tutors were instructed exclusively in the Laubach Way to Reading system, and it was possible to loan a complete set of materials to those reading specialists who wished to provide telephone assistance.

Staff envisioned a brief in-service, to familiarize the specialists with the training our tutors receive, and to discuss differences in instructing adults and children, which was the arena in which these reading specialists were active. This in-service did not materialize because we were advised that such "training" would not be well received.

Instead, three members received Laubach materials, and requested that volunteers with specific concerns be encouraged to telephone for assistance. Telephone numbers and times of availability were given to volunteers. To reduce the possibility of additional telephone zone charges, reading specialists and volunteers living in the same geographic area were assigned to each other. This limited system was in place by September, 1986. In addition a specialist in English as a second language, already trained as a tutor, volunteered her services as consultant.

From the outset, it became clear that while the staff felt a great need for the advice only an experienced reading specialist could give, and while volunteer tutors had problems and needed solutions, consulting an unknown person was not an appealing choice for tutors. The tutor identified with trainers at the workshop and perceived them as

experts. Thus, those staff members who participated in training workshops received calls for help. Six persons: the program director and her assistant and three full-time staff who serve as area coordinators, as well as the training coordinator, received calls for assistance. This procedure continued to be the main avenue through which volunteers made requests for help. Despite referrals for specialized situations, fewer than ten volunteers availed themselves of this type of assistance.

In January of 1987, GPLC hired a full-time reading specialist who had experience working with adult beginning readers. This staff member participated in training workshops, assessed students and made specific written recommendations to each new tutor about the student assignment and methods to be stressed. Because of the direct personal involvement with program, tutors and students, the staff reading specialist became the logical consultant.

Tutors trained since January have all met the staff reading specialist at their pre-service workshop. They feel free to call to ask for advice but most continue to call the area coordinator first. Those who come to the main office stop to discuss concerns. In addition, staff area coordinators refer specific problems to the reading specialist. This procedure ensures better control of advice being given and offers greater continuity of instruction from workshop training into its practical application.

Over the six months in which the reading specialist has been available to assist this 310 project, more than one hundred (100) tutors have benefitted from direct telephone or in-person consultations. Many more have been assisted indirectly through problems relayed by the area coordinator to the reading specialist who offers advice which is then relayed to tutors. This diffusing of assistance allows for maximum use of the reading specialist's talents and time.

Staff in-services provide another avenue for advice from the reading specialist to be disseminated amongst volunteer tutors.

CHAPTER 2

Geographical Clusters

The second support system we developed was to create local "Tutor Talks." Evaluations returned for a previous 310 project, which provided eight formal tutor in-service meetings, indicated that tutors appreciated the opportunity to share information with each other. We decided to increase these opportunities. Several models were developed and are outlined below. The rationale for each is to permit informal gatherings of volunteers in their own areas, but each grouping has certain distinct characteristics.

Model A: For a remote geographic area

From a tutor training workshop in a remote suburban library, a volunteer area coordinator had been recruited to assist our small staff to maintain contact and to offer support. This grouping was centered in the library at which it first trained, and was supported by the librarian who secured funding for supplementary materials for student and tutor use. As other volunteers from the area became trained, they were assigned to and coordinated by the volunteer area coordinator. Since it was difficult for most to attend any central support activities offered by the Council, this seemed an ideal location to start a "Tutor Talk". Indeed, this group provided the name.

Tutors were accustomed to receive a monthly support call from the coordinator and it was an easy step to add a reminder about the gathering on the second Thursday of each month. Since it was a regular day, it was possible to mark a calendar months in advance. Meetings are held from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. Refreshments are provided by the volunteers and the librarian offers tea and coffee. This has been on going since the inception of this project.

This group functions quite autonomously. Most meetings consist only of the tutors, anywhere from three to fifteen (of a group which varies from twenty to thirty tutoring pairs). However, the group has requested on occasion that the reading specialist attend, and also requested a "brush up" session by our training staff, since our training has changed significantly over the past year.

Model B: Small local zip code groups

To increase the support system, the Council was utilizing volunteer area coordinators recruited from active tutors to maintain contact with tutors in their specific geographical areas. Three of these coordinators were asked to organize "Tutor Talks" amongst their area tutors. Two variations developed. The largest group met in the local library on a bi-monthly basis. Tutors were notified by telephone by their coordinator, and met for one hour. No refreshments were provided. Fifteen tutors participated on an irregular basis.

The other two groups, being much smaller in number, elected to meet in the homes of volunteers. One coordinator encouraged a second to take charge of the group, hostessing and mailing postcards for the regular monthly meetings. The group consists of three to six tutors, but will grow as more tutors are trained. The second of these small group coordinators scheduled three meetings for her eight tutors, but cancelled at the last minute as the coordinator was reluctant to hold a two person meeting. Clearly, more staff assistance was required here to support the effort.

Model C: Staff organized "Tutor Talks"

Type 1 - GPLC is a co-sponsor of a special Project LEARN, the intent of which is to establish neighborhood - based literacy sites in areas which are economically and educationally disadvantaged. One aspect of the coordinator's job is to develop tutor and student support groups. Here is how one coordinator did this.

Brashear Association is a United Way multi - purpose center in a closely - knit area of mid- and eastern- European ancestry. Ethnic rivalries exist, and the very idea of "neighborhood ownership" of a literacy project through participation was controversial. Nonetheless, sixty percent of the forty volunteers recruited for this community project were local.

To celebrate the Christmas season and to promote a sense of unity, the coordinator arranged a party for tutors and students together in December, with food donated by local businesses. This was such a successful event that informal tutor get-togethers seemed a natural next step. Consequently, "Tutor Talks" were scheduled for the second Wednesday of each month January through April, at the neighborhood-based agency site. From 6 - 10 tutors were present each month, and overall, eighteen tutors attended. This represented a fifty percent (50%) participation. Change of staff from full to part-time, and the naturally slow period of summer stopped the meetings. They will be resumed on a regular basis in September.

The counterpart of this project, at Hill House, in a unified black neighborhood, was not as successful. The fact that the neighborhood was perceived as unsafe at night, coupled with the fact that many tutors worked full-time and were reluctant to give up Saturdays, contributed to a limited interest. Nonetheless, ten tutors attended the first meeting.

Staff turn over has delayed other attempts, but plans are underway to offer this opportunity again, in the fall.

The third neighborhood site is in McKeesport, a hard-hit former steel town with high unemployment. More than forty volunteers were quickly recruited, but finding students has taken longer than expected. Hence, meetings were needed to maintain the enthusiasm and confidence of the trained tutors while awaiting student assignments. A tutor gathering was arranged for June 17 with a "make it, take it" theme. A volunteer reading specialist led the group, demonstrating various teaching aids. Materials were provided to make the aids. Fourteen tutors attended. The coordinator plans to continue the informal gatherings on a bi-monthly schedule in the fall, when it is expected that all tutors will be placed.

Type 2 - GPLC has increased its staffing to ensure that every tutor has at least a part-time staff person to offer support. These positions were filled later than was expected, resulting in fewer staff-organized "Tutor Talks" during this special project time line. Nonetheless, two were arranged after active, tutoring volunteers were formed to assist with organizational matters. These were held after this project's expiration date, but they reflect examples of Model B. Both occured on the evening of July 29. One took place in the suburban library of Penn Hills, for those tutors who meet at that library, or live in the area. The second was held in the city neighborhood of Squirrel Hill at the home of the volunteer who was recruited to coordinate her zip code area. In each case, tutors were notified by letter. The staff person attended the first meeting to become acquainted with the tutors and to hear their concerns. In each case, a little time was taken to share program information. Sixteen tutors took advantage of these first meetings and plan to continue bi-monthly meetings under the same arrangement.

A third variant, reflecting the fact that the tutors concerned do not work outside the home, saw a half-dozen tutors join for a pot-luck luncheon in the near suburb of Bellevue. The full-time staff coordinator assisted with all initial arrangements, utilizing as coordinator a former tutor who is no longer active in that capacity, but wants to continue her association with the literacy council. She and the staff person prepared the invitational letter, and provision for mailing was provided at the council's branch office. The staff member was in attendance, utilizing the opportunity to share program news and developments and to hear concerns.

Our literacy council receives hundreds of inquiries from potential volunteers, many of whom do not follow through with any involvement. To test our theory that some are interested but do not have the time to become tutors, the new part-time staff coordinator for the South Hills mailed an invitation to such persons in her area to attend an informational meeting to discuss "other ways to volunteer". She was pleased with the response and has recruited volunteers to assist in many ways, including the coordination and management of "Tutor Talks" for active tutors in the area. Under her supervision, these volunteers will assume responsibility for scheduling notification, securing meeting rooms in community buildings, arranging refreshments if desired. This creative way to utilize more volunteers and thus free the part-time staff person's time for direct service to the tutors and students in her area of responsibility is one which we will initiate in other areas. "Tutor Talks" arranged in this way will begin in the fall of 1987 in several locations.

Chapter 3

Reunions of workshop classes

Too often after high quality pre-service training is completed, tutors find themselves experiencing a sense of isolation. Frequently the student expresses a desire to maintain anonymity through a sense of embarrasment at his lack of reading skills. The individualization of tutoring, one-on-one at times and locations most suited to the tutoring partnership, increases the isolation. In an attempt to provide an opportunity to recapture the fellowship enjoyed at the pre-service training, GPLC planned for a group of community-based literacy sites to have follow-up sessions. These were announced as a support activity to the workshop group, and scheduled to take place six weeks after training was completed. A survey questionaire was mailed to the trained tutors shortly before the follow-up session (attachment A). Tutors were requested to return the form, indicating area of concern. The training coordinator then prepared material to address these concerns. While attendance could not be required, it was strongly encouraged. More than fifty percent of the tutors attended these sessions, held in the same location as had been the initial training session. A total of 51 new tutors attended six follow-up sessions.

The response of those attending was gratifying. There was excitement and enthusiasm as the tutors shared and compared experiences. So successful was this support system that GPLC has incorporated this procedure into its training workshop. We now offer nine hours of pre-service training at the end of which tutors are matched, at the workshop, with their students. The fourth session, required for certification, has already been scheduled to follow in approximately six weeks. This serves as an inducement for tutors to start immediately, so that they will have experiences to share and concerns which will be addressed by the reading specialist who officiates.

It is anticipated that this new training arrangement will offer support, encourage tutors to continue to participate in informal "Tutor Talks" and ensure much more effective tutoring procedures. For a summary of tutor evaluations of this third system of support, reunions or "workshop follow up", please see attachment B .

Chapter 4

Mentors

It has been our experience, as I am sure it is for many literacy councils, that some new tutors feel extremely insecure at first and are very dependent on staff members for support in the early months of their tutoring. Staff members are aware of those strong tutors who could provide support and thus free staff for other duties. It was our goal to secure at least ten such tutors to become mentors to new tutors. This was the last system to be tested, and the results to date are disappointing.

A news item in the January issue of our newsletter invited tutors who were interested in becoming mentors to speak to their area coordinators. Nine tutors responded over the following month. Other appropriate tutors had been identified by staff and approached regarding their participation. A mentor job description was prepared (see attachment C).

For better monitoring it was decided to test the mentoring system in one area only, under the supervision of the experienced, full-time Assistant Program Director who also acts as an area coordinator. A letter preparing experienced tutors for this effort, explaining the need for mentors and including a job description was developed (attachment D). The plan was to place each newly-trained tutor from a workshop designated for that area with a local experienced tutor from the same area. Due to low registration for that workshop, the plan was postponed until October, 1987 when it will be attempted. Experience gained from the few attempts at assigning a mentor will, we hope, ensure more effective use of this method.

The mentoring assignments made in the spring of 1987 were ineffectual. In one case, the student decided against tutoring and the tutor against accepting another student. In two other attempts, despite

a clear explanation of the procedure and its purpose, the mentors felt summarily rejected and drew back. Assistance and monitoring fell back on the area coordinator. One mentoring assignment was successful. It involved an experienced tutor and trainer paired with a tutor whose student displayed needs similar to the mentor's student.

This approach is still viewed as a useful method of providing support, and we will continue to consider its use where appropriate.

A more informal method of mentoring is practiced in our program. Coordinators put tutors in touch with other tutors who have experienced similar tutoring problems. This has sometimes been successful. One other type of support we have noticed, while not precisely mentoring, is a situation in which two tutors become acquainted at a workshop and remain in touch after the workshop. We have also found that "Tutor Talks" encourage informal mentoring.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and recommendations

It is very clear that a volunteer literacy program is only as strong as its support systems. The majority of tutors are, before training, inexperienced in this field. Training may be of the highest quality, but without support and assistance readily at hand even the sturdiest and most committed tutor may falter and lose confidence as he pursues his volunteer role. Because the tutor recognizes the high quality of the training he received, because he can read and his student lacks proficiency in this area, the tutor who perceives little progress may assume this to be his fault. Unless he receives assurance from program personnel or can compare his experiences with those of other tutors, he may find his confidence weakening and begin to make excuses to avoid tutoring sessions.

None of us likes to prolong a negative experience. A tutor who begins to doubt his effectiveness, and who fails to receive adequate support and encouragement, may simply "slip away." The literacy program may never know whether the real reason was lack of commitment or lack of support at a crucial time. Tutor training emphasizes the importance of positive reinforcement for students. Clearly, it is equally important for tutor retention.

GPLC's program currently employs four full-time and three part-time area coordinators. Even so, we cannot provide sufficient individual support to five hundred tutors. It is essential to provide systems whereby the volunteers can reinforce each other, thus freeing staff for very specific problems and individual support for special needs as well as general program activity. After testing four systems of support, we draw the following conclusions.

1. "Tutor Talks", informal local gatherings of tutors, seem the best method of providing an opportunity for continued contact and support. Each group can choose the most convenient location and time and arrange the frequency of meetings to suit its particular members. Responsibilities for arrangements can be shared, or a non-tutoring volunteer can be recruited, thus freeing the staff coordinator for other program needs. Since the tutors help each other through the sharing of experiences and ideas, staff does not need to attend each meeting. However, such gatherings allow staff to introduce new concepts or reinforce program requirements from time to time.

GPLC plans to add a "regional news" page to its quarterly newsletter. Each of the four areas will list dates, times and locations of the tutor talks in the area during the following three months. While each group will have its regular membership, the newsletter listing will allow tutors an opportunity to select more than one meeting. Individual mailings of a group's schedule, or phone calls, or both can also be used for purposes of notification, depending on the particular group's preference.

Our experience would suggest caution against assigning too much responsibility to any one individual. We suggest that creative ways to bring in more volunteers should be encouraged. Using former tutors as "Tutor Talk" leaders is a rewarding way to recognize valued service yet provide a less demanding role within the program. An experienced volunteer may appreciate the opportunity to retain contact with the program without the more time-consuming commitment of tutoring. Such a person shares her experience with other tutors in a non-threatening way. A volunteer may be found who displays good organizational skills yet, while attracted to the program, may not make a good tutor. Such a person could be involved as a "Tutor Talk" coordinator for an area.

In all instances, program staff must provide leadership, training, coordination and thanks. Volunteers need constant encouragement and recognition. It is our view that whether a literacy program is urban or rural, staffed by professionals or all-volunteer, a system of "Tutor Talks" is a most effective support system.

2. The second most effective tutor support system we tested was found to be that of workshop reunions. These are advantageous because they offer an opportunity to bring together volunteers who first met at their pre-service training. Literacy tutoring can be an isolating activity. Programs should encourage opportunities to experience again that special sense of community and purpose which exists in the training workshop. Our volunteers were asked to return six weeks after training. Because they had tutored for periods ranging from two to five weeks, all came with good, practical questions. They described their students enthusiastically. GPLC felt that the opportunity to reinforce training just after the outset of the tutoring experience was extremely valuable. We have incorporated this into our regular workshop.

For those programs which do not choose to change their training structure, we still recommend follow-up reunions. How long after the workshop the reunion should occur will vary with particular program needs. We would recommend that such a session take place no more than six months after the workshop, preferably within three months. This should allow every tutor to have some tutoring experience with his/her student. Satisfaction with the reunion may lead to the formation of "Tutor Talks".

3. Telephone consultations with volunteer reading specialists were third in our recommendations for tutor support. While the system as implemented did not work well for us, we believe that given certain guidelines, it can provide an effective support system for programs which do not have a

staff reading specialist. We believe it to be essential that such advisors attend a regular tutor training workshop. Only by experiencing the training which the lay tutor undergoes can the specialists give effective advice. Those reading specialists who believe that they have no need for training could be called upon to present enrichment and supplemental ideas at an in-service.

4. Mentoring was the least effective support system of the four we tested. We have many thoughts about mentoring, mostly unscientific. It may be that literacy tutoring attracts individuals who prefer more solitary activities. Sharing is appreciated in an informal group setting, but when offered as advice by a more experienced tutor, may seem condescending. The tutor may feel "checked up on", and only feel comfortable when program staff does this. Whether this accounts for the rejection our mentors experienced, we cannot say. Nonetheless, in principle the system is good, and we would welcome information on the successful use of mentors in other programs. We intend to test the system again in October 1987.

In conclusion, the GPLC is grateful to the Pennsylvania Department of Education for the opportunity to develop and test these four methods of tutor support. We anticipate much more effective contact and support, and better tutor retention as a result of this special 310 project. The student, who is our primary concern, can only benefit from the increased support we are offering our tutors.

NAME _____ ATTACHMENT A

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

FOLLOW-UP IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP

Six weeks after your pre-service workshops, we will provide an in-service session to further assist you in your tutoring experience. In order for us to plan a meaningful session, we need your input.

Below are eight areas which were covered in your in-service workshops. For each area, please indicate whether or not you need additional training. Check either the "No" or "Yes" column for each area. If possible, indicate specific problems for those areas in which you need additional assistance.

AREA	NO	YES	DO YOU NEED MORE TRAINING IN THIS AREA? (SPECIFY, IF POSSIBLE)
1. Characteristics of Adult Learners			
2. Laubach Way to Reading			
3. Language Experience			
4. Developing a Lesson			
5. Motivating Students/ Retention of Students			
6. Record Keeping			
7. Designing Instructional Materials			
8. Treating Specific Reading Problems			

Other:
(Additional Suggestions)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

FOLLOW-UP TRAINING

Project LEARN

A. Please check how you feel about each of these statements:

	very well	fairly well	not very well	not at all
1. The objectives of this Follow-Up Training	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. The activity chosen for this Follow-Up Training	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. The assistance I received to help improve my tutoring experience.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. The assistance I received from the other tutors.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. The ideas generated at this Follow-Up Session.	_____	_____	_____	_____

B. Please describe any special strengths or weaknesses you noticed about the following:

1. Physical environment (room, tables, etc.)

2. Length/pace of this session

3. Attitude/teaching ability of the trainer(s)

4. Response/involvement of the tutors

C. What changes would you suggest for improving or strengthening a future Follow-Up Workshop?

FOLLOW-UP WORKSHOP SESSION

EVALUATION

Location_____

Date_____

	Very Well	Somewhat	Not At All
1. How useful were the topics for your tutoring situation?	_____	_____	_____
Name one specific thing you learned which you can use in tutoring_____			
_____			
2. Did you learn today what you expected to learn?	_____	_____	_____
3. Do you feel the questions you had before and during the session were satisfactorily answered?	_____	_____	_____
If not, what questions do you still have?_____			
_____			
_____			
4. Was the session too long, too short, just right? (circle one choice)			
5. Are tutor meetings important to you? Why or why not?_____	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
6. Would you recommend this session to other tutors?	_____	_____	_____
7. How would you suggest we improve this session ? Include possible topics_____			
_____			
_____			
8. How useful was it to have a reading resource person on hand?	_____	_____	_____
9. How well do you feel GPLC/PROJECT LEARN is providing you with the support you need?	_____	_____	_____

How can we better aid you?_____

_____

_____

10. How well did your pre-service (12 hour workshop) prepare you for your tutoring venture?

ATTACHMENT A 3

Project LEARN

BRASHEAR ASSOCIATION
2005 SARAH STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15203

EVALUATION

PROJECT LEARN FOLLOW-UP SESSION

1. Did you feel that the follow-up session addressed the needs you identified after the initial training?

2. What improvements do you feel could have been made in this follow-up session to better meet your (or other tutors') needs?

3. Other comments or observations:

ATTACHMENT B

FOLLOW-UP TRAINING

Project LEARN

12/11/86

A. Please check how you feel about each of these statements:

	very well	fairly well	not very well	not at all
1. The objectives of this Follow-Up Training	8 ||||| III	1 |||||		
2. The activity chosen for this Follow-Up Training	6 ||||| I	2 ||		
3. The assistance I received to help improve my tutoring experience.	7 ||||| II	2 ||		
4. The assistance I received from the other tutors.	7 ||||| II	2 ||		
5. The ideas generated at this Follow-Up Session.	8 ||||| III	1			

B. Please describe any special strengths or weaknesses you noticed about the following:

1. Physical environment (room, tables, etc.)
   Very good Comfortable Good, Fine this time
2. Length/pace of this session
   Good Two hrs. is sufficient, Fine Late Starting
   Very Good
3. Attitude/teaching ability of the trainer(s)
   Excellent - very helpful helpful very competent
   Good Very Good Great Super
4. Response/involvement of the tutors
   Very cooperative helpful Great Good
   They are sincere + care This time the tutors were allowed to talk

C. What changes would you suggest for improving or strengthening a future Follow-Up Workshop? More of the same None Nothing
Tutors should meet approximately every six months for fellowship
Urge tutors to be on time Have city-wide so there will be more progress
Not certain at this time. Everything's fine

22

FOLLOW-UP WORKSHOP SESSION

ATTACHMENT B 1

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Location McKeesport YMCA

Date 4/9/87

	Very Well	Somewhat	Not At All
1. How useful were the topics for your tutoring situation?	91%	9%	
Name one specific thing you learned which you can use in tutoring			
2. Did you learn today what you expected to learn?	60%	40%	
3. Do you feel the questions you had before and during the session were satisfactorily answered?	91%	9%	
If not, what questions do you still have?			
4. Was the session too long, too short, just right? (circle one choice)	(100%)		
5. Are tutor meetings important to you? Why or why not?	86%	14%	
6. Would you recommend this session to other tutors?	100%		
7. How would you suggest we improve this session? Include possible topics			
8. How useful was it to have a reading resource person on hand?	90%	10%	
9. How well do you feel GPLC/PROJECT LEARN is providing you with the support you need?	100%		

How can we better aid you?

10. How well did your pre-service (12 hour workshop) prepare you for your tutoring venture?

McKeesport LEARN Follow-Up Workshop

SUMMARY: EVALUATION NARRATIVE

1. Name one specific thing you learned which you can use in tutoring:

   1. reinforce student's "success" feeling (2)
   2. how to advance more quickly to another lesson
   3. student should have a goal
   4. encourage the student's writing skills
   5. helping my student with comprehension
   6. all ideas were helpful
   7. that we all make mistakes
   8. acceptance of students desire to advance beyond formal training
   9. the need to do language experience even though my student writes
   10. have confidence in myself as a new tutor, even though it is all new to me.

2. What questions do you still have?

   1. none
   2. dealing with grief
   3. the sequence of tutoring--whether to follow the Teacher's Manual for the most part.

3. Are tutor meetings important to you? Why or why not?

   1. Yes, they add a new insight
   2. Yes
   3. It gives a chance to relate experiences with people who are in similar circumstances.
   4. reinforce previous sessions.
   5. Yes, because of the opportunity for problem solving
   6. Yes, it's great to share experiences and get recharged.
   7. They bring out problems and answers similar to my own.
   8. The exchange of ideas and/or methods other tutors have found effective
   9. To get other ideas
   10. Yes, we can compare and learn from other tutors.
   11. I pick up ideas from other tutors, as well as our teachers.

4. How would you suggest we improve this session? Possible topics?

   1. Session handled very well, not much to add
   2. Story Mapping
   3. I think Martha and Lynn are very understanding and very helpful--doing just fine as far as I am concerned.
   4. We'll answer this next time

5. How can we better aid you?

   1. continue meetings
   2. don't know at this time (2)
   3. I do need a copy of the students Challenger book
   4. need outside materials to use with Challenger
   5. no problem here--I know there is always someone to call if I need help

Page 2: Evaluation Summary (Narrative)

6. How well did your pre-service (12 hour workshop) prepare you for your tutoring venture?

1. The workshop seemed to cover all the problems (which aren't many) that might come across.
2. Very well, one is not going into a situation cold. Techniques were valuable.
3. Overall, it was very effective and I was able to recognize and handle a potentially difficult area with my student I would have otherwise missed.
4. Quite well
5. Fairly well, I still have a lot to learn myself.
6. Very well (2)
7. Although I wasn't sure how much I had learned at the workshop, during a session, things will come back that I was taught and I realize how much I did learn.

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

Job Description: Tutor Mentor

I. Definition

A. Purpose: To offer support and advice to a newly matched vounteer tutor, and so further the mission of the GPLC

B. Reports to Area coordinator

II. Duties

A. Contacts new volunteer tutor immediately upon assignment to introduce self and offer support

B. Provides support for new tutors first six months by

i) weekly telephone contact for one month
ii) biweekly telephone contact for two months
iii) monthly telephone contact for three months

C. Available for requests for support from new tutor at mutually agreed upon times

D. Reports to Area coordinator on match progress, and any additional support needed.

III. Qualifications

A. Experience: at least 3 months experience tutoring.

B. Recommendation of Area Coordinator

IV. Time: - 6 months (see II B.)

ATTACHMENT D

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

5920 Kirkwood Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

(412) 661-7323

Tutoring can be a lonely experience. We need your help in making a new tutor's tutoring experience a positive one. We would like to do this by assigning each incoming tutor a mentor.

By consenting to be a mentor you can help a new tutor gain the confidence, which we all need, for their first tutoring experience.

We plan to assign mentors to tutors signing up for the march workshop to be held on the North Side.

Enclosed is a job description for a mentor. Please indicate your interest by returning the form below.

(Cut off and return)

Return to: Pam King
Allegheny Regional
Allegheny Square
Pgh., PA 15212

☐ I wish to be a mentor. The new tutor may reach me at _____ between the hours of _____ to _____.

☐ I do not wish to be a mentor.

Name: _____